

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Tennessee at Martin (U336S140076)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	12
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Total	107	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The University of Tennessee at Martin (U336S140076)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. 1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.
 - 2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
 - ii) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
 - iii) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

Strengths:

The introduction of this proposal offers persuasive reasons for "creatively destructing" (p.1) the existing teacher education program. It offers thoughtful background on what factors have caused the Teacher Education Program ineffective results as reported in the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) 2013 Report Card. One such factor is the current Tenure/Review/Promotion criteria for TEP faculty (p.4), which does not require faculty to collaborate with LEAs. In addition, results from past RTTT funding has been mixed when specifically looking at the needs of LEAs in West Tennessee. The proposed project should improve services dramatically with its transformation goals and lead to system change. The creation of a STEM Center at the university in the heart of the rural region should create a pipeline for STEM educators.

Weaknesses:

The introduction appears to serve as the Significance portion of the grant narrative. Labeling it accordingly would improve the proposal. The data from the 2013 report card on Teacher Effectiveness suggest that UT Martin teachers are typically less effective than their peers who graduated from a TEP at other Tennessee universities. The proposal does not clarify in what ways other universities are better preparing at their candidates, which would improve the narrative (p.13). Using those factors as foundations for transformation would be more powerful.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
 - 2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:
 - i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

ii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

iii) The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

v) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application (www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops (www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html) to help design their logic models. In addressing this criterion, applicants are also encouraged to connect the project design to the intended impact of the project, including an explanation of how the project will affect the preparation, placement, retention, induction, and professional development of teachers, and ultimately student achievement. Finally, applicants are encouraged to discuss the role and commitment of each partner and how the IHE and LEA(s) plan to sustain their partnership beyond the life of the grant.

Strengths:

The proposal describes deconstructing and reinventing the Teacher Education Program. One strength is the identification of mentor cooperating teachers and providing them training on their roles and responsibilities. Adding a full year of field experiences is another strength. The fifth year certification program for STEM teachers will also result in increasing the number of STEM teachers in the middle and high schools. Another strength is the focus on integrating the TEAM standards and evaluation rubrics into the TEP curriculum and student teaching experience to better align teacher preparation with current statewide practices (p.8). The list of goals and objectives (pp.11-12) were very comprehensive. The university plans to hire 15 mentors to regularly visit new teachers and Fifth-year candidates in the schools on a monthly basis. This is a very proactive support provided by the university (p.20).

Weaknesses:

This proposal would be stronger if the LEAs played more of a role in helping to redesign the Teacher Education Program. An example of how increased collaboration could look is with the STEM Center. Although well-intentioned, letting LEAs check out manipulatives from the STEM Center is a very limited short term solution (p.21). Purchasing technology and other resources for LEAs would better align the teacher preparation program with the instruction in the LEAs and demonstrate true collaboration. The addition of the COMP (p.22), a classroom management plan, to the Teacher Education Program and training faculty in it is noteworthy; however, a more effective approach would be to co-train LEA and TEP faculty together. An additional concern is whether COMP is aligned to current practices within the LEAs. No emphasis is given to literacy training as outlined in Absolute Priority #1 (p.31). Explaining the criteria for how mentor cooperating teachers from the LEAs will be identified would strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

iii) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include in the application narrative a clear, well thought-out implementation plan that includes annual timelines, key project milestones, and a schedule of activities with sufficient time for developing an adequate implementation plan, as well as a description and qualifications of the personnel who would be responsible for each activity and the level of effort each activity entails. Applicants may also describe how the partnering organizations will communicate and coordinate in order to achieve project goals.

Strengths:

The timeline for T-Process (pp.26-36) was comprehensive. Aligning each task back to the proposal's objectives was excellent. Another strength of the management plan are the qualifications of the the key project personnel. The management plan provides Table 6 (p.41), which relies heavily on feedback from the various teams involved. This, in turn, will provide valuable feedback for continuous improvement.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Note: In response to this selection factor, applicants are encouraged to include data on student learning.

ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Note: In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project s evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as well as the measures established in section 204(a) of the HEA. (The specific performance measures established for the overall TQP Grant Program are discussed under Performance Measures in section VI of this notice.) Further, applicants are encouraged to describe how the applicant s evaluation plan will be designed to collect both output data and outcome data, including benchmarks, to monitor progress. Finally, each applicant is encouraged to select an independent, objective evaluator who has experience in evaluating educational programs and

who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project s evaluation.

Strengths:

A strength of the project evaluation is the identification of an external evaluator who has previously worked successfully with the university on other large scale projects (p.42). An inquiry inquiry process of evaluation is recommended, which will provide a deep analysis of data.

Weaknesses:

The assessment tools used for measuring student achievement rely on standardized testing and perception surveys. Adding multiple measures of student learning would improve this proposal.

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

1. Projects that are designed to address one or both of the following priority areas:

a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects.

b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

Note: Applicants that respond to Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Absolute Priority 1 are still required to implement the required reforms within the whole teacher preparation program, as reflected in sections (a) and (b) of Absolute Priority 1.

In responding to this competitive preference priority, applicants are encouraged to include the following elements in their proposed projects:

1) Institutional collaboration to ensure that students in a college of education who intend to teach STEM courses have access to courses that build appropriate content knowledge. Such students should have access to course sequencing that is equal to the course sequencing for other STEM majors outside the college of education.

2) Emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers, including dedicated research or laboratory experiences, STEM discipline-specific pedagogical instruction, and explicit instruction in the interdisciplinary connections between learning sciences and STEM instruction; and

3) Early and multiple field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are structured to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum.

Strengths:

This proposal will create a STEM Center contributed to by several of the colleges within the university. Two newly dedicated faculty positions will be funded (one in math and one in science) to teach within the center. A strength of this proposal is the professional development that will be provided by the center to LEAs and STEM candidates.

Weaknesses:

A weakness of the proposal is the lack of early practicum experiences for teacher candidates prior to their junior year.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

1. Projects that are designed to support the implementation of internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States and to improve instruction and learning, including projects in the following priority areas:

a) The development or implementation of professional development or preparation programs aligned with those standards.

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

A strength of this proposal is the opportunity to align the Teacher Education Program to standards based instruction. Faculty will be trained in the Common Core and Tennessee Curriculum and Teaching Standards (p.22) by TNCORE (Northwest Tennessee Center of Regional Excellence), which is housed at the university.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 02:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2014 04:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Tennessee at Martin (U336S140076)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Total	107	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The University of Tennessee at Martin (U336S140076)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. 1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.
 - 2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
 - ii) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
 - iii) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant's project will improve services by addressing concerns noted in the present program (pages 1-5). A revised teacher education program is proposed to address gaps in training, teacher performance, and access to training. For example, the applicant will address the needs of their teacher training since their teachers do not perform as well as teachers who graduate from other teacher education program as demonstrated by data. The applicant also cites, for example, the inability of rural LEAs to take advantage of STEM hubs created by a recent federal award because of distance. Rural LEAs could ill-afford to send teachers 2.5 hours away and incur the cost of travel and accommodations, along with the cost of a substitute teacher. As a result, the STEM hub in West Tennessee serves primarily Shelby County (Memphis) and some surrounding districts (page 3). This is one area where the program will address.

(ii) Due to recent changes in legislation and given the data provided in the narrative (pages 1-5), the applicant's project is likely to result in system change. Specifically, the Teacher Quality Program guidelines align with the new academic standards, and this proposal will buttress the preparation of the applicant's teacher education program to meet accreditation standards. This will result in permanent change to the program structure.

(iii) The applicant's project is likely to address personnel shortages within the rural school districts. The applicant already places a number of its teachers in rural districts. Over the past 10 years, the applicant has formed or continued meaningful partnerships with over 80% of the rural LEAs across the West Tennessee region, and professional development has been provided to teachers in the subjects of math, physics, chemistry, special education, reading, English as a second language, and American history (page 3).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

ii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

iii) The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

v) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application (www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops (www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html) to help design their logic models. In addressing this criterion, applicants are also encouraged to connect the project design to the intended impact of the project, including an explanation of how the project will affect the preparation, placement, retention, induction, and professional development of teachers, and ultimately student achievement. Finally, applicants are encouraged to discuss the role and commitment of each partner and how the IHE and LEA(s) plan to sustain their partnership beyond the life of the grant.

Strengths:

(i) No strengths were noted.

(ii) The project demonstrates professional development that are of sufficient quality, intensity and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the school districts (pages 5-11). The new program will incorporate a new STEM center that will provide additional professional development in this area. Additionally, the applicant will develop a fifth year program to transition individuals holding a baccalaureate degree with a math or science major into teacher candidates. This program, developed in Year 3, will recruit graduates with baccalaureate degrees into a one-year intensive program to prepare these graduates for teaching.

(iii) Goals and objectives cited in the narrative present a coherent and sustained program of training in the field (pages 10-13). The new training is revised for recruitment, satisfying requirements and placement. This will ensure that all teachers persist with consistent training by the applicant.

(iv) The applicant provides substantial information on present partnerships and will build on these partnerships in terms of implementing the professional development (page 14). The title of projects and funding sources are provided. Previous and current partners are appropriate to conducting project activities.

(v) No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:

(i) The narrative on pages 5 through 10 cites excerpts from CCSSO report, a document from the U.S. Department of Education, and an evaluation from the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). This information does not represent strong theory as the documents are not representative of conducted studies but rather guidance documents that lead to program performance.

(v) Absent from the narrative is a discussion of how project activities will continue once funding has ended. It is unclear how the STEM center will persist. For example, it is unclear how or if the LEAs will commit their own funding to project activities.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

iii) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include in the application narrative a clear, well thought-out implementation plan that includes annual timelines, key project milestones, and a schedule of activities with sufficient time for developing an adequate implementation plan, as well as a description and qualifications of the personnel who would be responsible for each activity and the level of effort each activity entails. Applicants may also describe how the partnering organizations will communicate and coordinate in order to achieve project goals.

Strengths:

(i) The management plan is comprehensive with tasks, milestones and designated personnel (pages 26-36). The management plan is provided for all the years of the project. Much of the project activities that affect actual training and professional development for teachers are scheduled to start in 2016, so the applicant conducts much of the creative destruction of the present teacher education program. The launch of the STEM center and the first iteration of the new teacher education program begins in Fall of 2014 (page 31). The management plan have projects completing on time.

(ii) Qualifications of designated personnel appear relevant to project activities (pages 36-38). Key positions such as the Dual STEM Coordinator are tasked at 100% and will devote all of their time to the project. Other positions have experience that are relevant to the project. For example, the Project Coordinator will coordinate the daily operations of the project to meet the milestones of the project timeline. Specifically, will work appropriate personnel to assure that major project components are on track for implementation according to budget (STEM/TEP hires, Student Teacher Expo, Targeted Professional Development, hiring of mentors for New Teacher Induction Program and fifth-year STEM candidates). The Project Coordinator will serve as the Team Leader for the Evaluation Team, and also serve on the Management and Instruction and Development Teams. Prepare monthly reports to share with the partnering LEAs.

(iii) The applicant provides ample evidence that feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the project (page 41). For example, the applicant will have teams with specific functions. For example, the management team will discuss project progress and issues at quarterly meetings. The Instruction and Design team will meet monthly in the first year to monitor and guide the curriculum revision process. The evaluation team will collect and analyze data and meet monthly in the first year and then quarterly.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Note: In response to this selection factor, applicants are encouraged to include data on student learning.

ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Note: In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project's evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as well as the measures established in section 204(a) of the HEA. (The specific performance measures established for the overall TQP Grant Program are discussed under Performance Measures in section VI of this notice.) Further, applicants are encouraged to describe how the applicant's evaluation plan will be designed to collect both output data and outcome data, including benchmarks, to monitor progress. Finally, each applicant is encouraged to select an independent, objective evaluator who has experience in evaluating educational programs and who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project's evaluation.

Strengths:

(i) The methods of evaluation includes both process and outcomes based measurements that are appropriate to project goals and objectives (pages 42-50). Specifically, data collection includes both quantitative and qualitative assessments that produce such data. The external evaluator uses the logic model with goals and objectives including measuring the effectiveness of the partnerships, the teacher program and the STEM preparation. The methods are clearly aligned with the project.

(ii) Methods are feasible and appropriate to the goals (pages 42-50). In addition to outcomes measures, the applicant conducts process evaluations. For example, guiding questions are posed to examine the program (page 50). Examples of such questions are "How do we collect and report on the demographics and trends of the teaching profession in West Tennessee? Are we lacking critical/important data points that will inform our teachers' aptitude in the field? How can we use this type of data to enhance preparation programs at the university?" The questions guide the process evaluation to assist the applicant in evaluating its efforts.

(iii) As part of the evaluation team, the external evaluator will participate in monthly meetings after the first year-then quarterly meetings in subsequent years (management plan). In this way, the applicant will receive performance feedback. This will be used to inform project administrators.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

1. Projects that are designed to address one or both of the following priority areas:

a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects.

b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

Note: Applicants that respond to Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Absolute Priority 1 are still required to implement the required reforms within the whole teacher preparation program, as reflected in sections (a) and (b) of Absolute Priority 1.

In responding to this competitive preference priority, applicants are encouraged to include the following elements in their proposed projects:

1) Institutional collaboration to ensure that students in a college of education who intend to teach STEM courses have access to courses that build appropriate content knowledge. Such students should have access to course sequencing that is equal to the course sequencing for other STEM majors outside the college of education.

2) Emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers, including dedicated research or laboratory experiences, STEM discipline-specific pedagogical instruction, and explicit instruction in the interdisciplinary connections between learning sciences and STEM instruction; and

3) Early and multiple field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are structured to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum.

Strengths:

The applicant addresses most of this criterion. The creation of the STEM centers will increase the number of individuals trained in this area. The STEM center will provide hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers. The professional development years area expanded to a fifth year in the program. Early and multiple field-based experiences are provide in the program. The applicant's project adds faculty in math and science.

Weaknesses:

It is also unclear how the program will increase the number of students from underrepresented groups. For example, the applicant does not amend its recruitment program for such purposes. It is unclear if the applicant will increase such numbers among women, minorities or students with disabilities.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

1. Projects that are designed to support the implementation of internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States and to improve instruction and learning, including projects in the following priority areas:

a) The development or implementation of professional development or preparation programs aligned with those standards.

b) Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.

Strengths:

(a) The applicant aligns its program with Common Core Standards aligned with state standards (page 2). In response not only to this funding initiative but also the newly released Council of Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards (August 2013), the newly revised Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards (April 2013), and the Tennessee Promise Legislation (to be enacted Fall 2015), UT Martin will transform its current Teacher Education Program (TEP) to include: The professional development and preparation program is aligned with those standards. Specifically, the applicant aligns its STEM center with college- and career-ready academic standards. (page 1)

(b) The strategies translate into classroom practice as teachers are encouraged to use technology to video performance. Such information will be used for training. The training is targeted to partnering rural school districts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2014 04:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2014 11:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The University of Tennessee at Martin (U336S140076)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	45	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Implementing Academic Standards		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Total	107	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2014 TQP Grant Review - 5: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The University of Tennessee at Martin (U336S140076)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. 1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.
- 2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
 - ii) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.
 - iii) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

Strengths:

- i) The applicant's proposed project is clearly likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population. The applicant states University of Tennessee (UT) Martin will develop a STEM Center for Teaching and Learning. UT Martin will also hire two dual-appointment faculty (math and education, science and education) to assist with the Fifth-year program and the development of the STEM Center (pg. 21).
- ii) The applicant clearly illustrates the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. The applicant states the proposed project will encourage and facilitate collaboration among business, industry, education, and state policymakers to ensure a skilled, and capable future workforce (pg.22). Additionally, the STEM Center will provide STEM-related professional development to meet the identified needs of local education agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary instructors (pg. 21)
- iii) The applicant's clearly demonstrates a proposed project which will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. UT Martin will implement the creative destruction of its current (teacher education program)TEP to build stronger partnerships with LEAs to improve the education of UT Martin teacher candidates and the quality of teacher graduates seeking employment in area school districts (pg. 5)

Weaknesses:

- i) None noted.
- ii) None noted.
- iii) None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:

i) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).

ii) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

iii) The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

iv) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

v) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to develop logic models to demonstrate their project's theory of action. Applicants should connect available evidence of past history of successful outcomes to their logic models. Applicants may use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory's Education Logic Model Application (www.relpacific.mcrel.org/PERR.html) or the Northeast and Islands REL Skill Builder Workshops (www.relnei.org/events/skill-builder-archive.html) to help design their logic models. In addressing this criterion, applicants are also encouraged to connect the project design to the intended impact of the project, including an explanation of how the project will affect the preparation, placement, retention, induction, and professional development of teachers, and ultimately student achievement. Finally, applicants are encouraged to discuss the role and commitment of each partner and how the IHE and LEA(s) plan to sustain their partnership beyond the life of the grant.

Strengths:

i) The applicant provides a limited illustration of a proposed project which is supported by strong theory. The applicant cites theory by Darling-Hammond (2014, June 30) which suggests that teachers need more feedback from their peers and mentors, who can generally offer more targeted insights on how to teach specific curriculum concepts and students (pg. 13).

ii) The applicant clearly describes training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. For example, the applicant states during the Fall semester, practicum will include classroom observations, working in cooperative groups with cooperating teachers, methods coursework and analysis, assessment literacy, and experiencing how schools, teachers, principals and administration work together to create the optimal learning environment. During the Spring semester, students will teach under the guidance of trained mentoring faculty and cooperating teachers with video capture of student teachers in action (pg. 12).

iii) The applicant's proposed activities sufficiently constitutes a coherent, sustained program of training in the field. The applicant states during the spring of the senior year, candidates will complete the remaining two teaching assignments with cooperating teachers. Students will submit a video of themselves teaching (ps.19). Candidates will also maintain a reflective journal chronicling their experiences in the schools.

iv) None noted.

v) None noted.

Weaknesses:

i) The applicant does not provide enough evidence of strong theories which assisted in the development of the project's framework. 6 points not awarded.

ii) None noted.

iii) None noted.

iv) The applicant does not describe services to be provided by the proposed project which will involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. The applicant mentions previous partnerships and collaboratives in the narrative, but fails to address current and existing partnerships as it relates to this proposed project (pgs. 14-15). 6 pts. not awarded.

v) The applicant does not demonstrate that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence. No page found. 7 pts. not awarded.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

iii) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

Note: In order to address this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include in the application narrative a clear, well thought-out implementation plan that includes annual timelines, key project milestones, and a schedule of activities with sufficient time for developing an adequate implementation plan, as well as a description and qualifications of the personnel who would be responsible for each activity and the level of effort each activity entails. Applicants may also describe how the partnering organizations will communicate and coordinate in order to achieve project goals.

Strengths:

i) The applicant clearly illustrates a comprehensive management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (pgs. 26-36).

ii) The applicant provides a detailed illustration of the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of

proposed key project personnel. For example, the applicant states the Project Coordinator position will be dedicated to the project 100%. The individual to be hired for this position shall have a Master's Degree in Education or related field and extensive experience in K-12 classroom settings, ability to read state reports on student achievement and work with teachers in adjusting teaching methodologies. Additional experience is required in working knowledge of Tennessee assessments of students, teachers, and administrators (pgs. 37-39).

iii) The applicant demonstrates evidence of performance feedback and continuous improvement methods and how those methods will be integral to the design of the proposed project (pg. 39-42). The applicant indicates Project Coordinator, Project Resource Specialist, and Grant Accountant monitor and coordinate the continuing planning and management needs of project activities on a monthly basis.

Weaknesses:

i) None noted.

ii) None noted.

iii) None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:

i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Note: In response to this selection factor, applicants are encouraged to include data on student learning.

ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Note: In addressing this criterion, applicants are encouraged to include a plan for how the project s evaluation will address the TQP Grant Program performance measures established by the Department under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), as well as the measures established in section 204(a) of the HEA. (The specific performance measures established for the overall TQP Grant Program are discussed under Performance Measures in section VI of this notice.) Further, applicants are encouraged to describe how the applicant s evaluation plan will be designed to collect both output data and outcome data, including benchmarks, to monitor progress. Finally, each applicant is encouraged to select an independent, objective evaluator who has experience in evaluating educational programs and who will play an active role in the design and implementation of the project s evaluation.

Strengths:

i) The applicant clearly describes a proposed evaluation plan which can provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools (PREPS), Inc., at Mississippi State University will conduct the needs assessment analysis and external evaluation for Project T-PROCESS. The applicant indicates the assessment will entail focus groups and surveys to capture the nuances of individual schools and demographics (pgs. 41-45).

ii) The applicant clearly describes methods of evaluation which are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals,

objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. For example, the applicant indicates student data to be collected will consist of (a) demographic information for control and treatment groups, (b) pre and post participant surveys, (c) classroom observations, (d) pre and post treatment mentor teacher surveys, and (e) other records/products (portfolios, journals, lesson plans, etc.) (pgs. 43-44).

iii) The applicant adequately describes methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the applicant states the Project Coordinator will monitor monthly budget reports and expenditures to assure compliance with federal regulations (pgs. 41-42)

Weaknesses:

i) None noted.

ii) None noted.

iii) None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting STEM Education

1. Projects that are designed to address one or both of the following priority areas:

a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects.

b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers or educators of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

Note: Applicants that respond to Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Absolute Priority 1 are still required to implement the required reforms within the whole teacher preparation program, as reflected in sections (a) and (b) of Absolute Priority 1.

In responding to this competitive preference priority, applicants are encouraged to include the following elements in their proposed projects:

1) Institutional collaboration to ensure that students in a college of education who intend to teach STEM courses have access to courses that build appropriate content knowledge. Such students should have access to course sequencing that is equal to the course sequencing for other STEM majors outside the college of education.

2) Emphasis on hands-on and inquiry-based STEM experiences for prospective teachers, including dedicated research or laboratory experiences, STEM discipline-specific pedagogical instruction, and explicit instruction in the interdisciplinary connections between learning sciences and STEM instruction; and

3) Early and multiple field-based instructional experiences for prospective teachers that are structured to provide exposure to a variety of teaching and learning environments, and that are coordinated and aligned with the teacher preparation curriculum.

Strengths:

a) The applicant clearly proposes a plan to increase the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers or other educators of STEM subjects. The applicant states the proposed project will offer

targeted professional development for the Teacher Education Program (TEP) Faculty and LEAs in LEAS or at University of Tennessee Martin. (pgs. 26-36).

b) None noted.

Weaknesses:

a) None noted.

b) The applicant does not address this criteria.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Implementing Academic Standards

1. **Projects that are designed to support the implementation of internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States and to improve instruction and learning, including projects in the following priority areas:**

a) **The development or implementation of professional development or preparation programs aligned with those standards.**

b) **Strategies that translate the standards into classroom practice.**

Strengths:

a) None noted.

b) None noted.

Weaknesses:

a) The applicant provides minimal evidence demonstrating sufficient plans to develop or implement of professional development or preparation programs aligned with internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards held in common by multiple States. (pg.10)

b) Because the applicant provides very little information related in their strategies related to the Common Core or other bench-marked standards. it is impossible to assess whether the limited strategies will translate into success.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/19/2014 11:40 PM